Route 8
Frederick, Md. 21701
May 27, 1975

Mark Lane
Citizens Commission of Inquiry
103 Second St. NE
Washington, D. C. 20002

Dear Mark:

If anything about you and the self-serving things you do could be amusing, it would be the childish letter dated the 23rd and here today.

You remind me of a self-conceived great mountain that in its belching can't deliver itself of a mouse in the second day of gestation.

However, I have never known you to be as generous as in speaking of me:

"In the past, in your own way, you have made a contribution to the body of knowledge about the death of John Kennedy."

Coming from a man who wasn't capable of meeting his own publishing contract, wasn't able to do all his own original work and beginning with that had to steal the work of others to keep going, this is indeed a compliment.

Coming from the man whose only and unoriginal book had a doctrine so foul he eliminated the identifications of t he staff lawyers who did the dirty work so he could pin it on his personal enemies, particularly Earl Warren, and edited the pretendedly verbatim transcripts to this end, insults are flattery.

Coming from the man who foolishly said he'd sue Wesley Liebeler for calling him a liar and then kept running with his tail between his legs; the man whose friends persuaded me to abandon my second book to take after Liebeler for him; the man who hated me for saving him and couldn't even say "thanks"; the man who on tape defended stealing when his own thefts were proven; the man who invented nonexistent footnotes to pretend he had sources other than his thievery; the man who even stole an intelligence "black book" and commercialized it as his own; and a man who as of his last week's press conference had yet to learn the simplest, most elemental facts of this assassination, no insult is possible.

There are two kinds of crooks, those who know they are thieves and those who can't admit it to themselves. You are the pious kind.

Don't write me the kind of self-serving letter this represents. I'm no more afraid of you now than I was when I called your bluff after, having proven your repeated thefts to your face on a TV show I foolishly gave you, you threatened to punch me in the nose "after the show". I asked you, "Why wait?" My nose remains unpunched.

Of those I mentioned in the speech I was too sick to make neither you nor a single other has written or called to complain that I erred or was in any way unkind. The fact is, if you are not too sick with self-importance to recognize it, that I did understate.

You and the nuts you exploit have whored around all these years whenever it seemed profitable, in cash or personal attention, and have actually come to believe your own propaganda.

My concern at NYU was explicit. You even stole a copy of my speech. You promised to return it and haven't. We'll see when the Rockefeller Report comes out who knows what he says, who is genuine and who a faker. We'll see what they do with what you and your pals did and said.

From the first, knowing you to be a cheap crook and an egocentric who would do anything to promote himself, I have had a low opinion of you. But I never dreamed you could lower yourself to this kind of obscenity: "...persons who should be viewed by you as co-workers, indicates you have a severe problem. I hope that you will take this judgment in the spirit in which it is offered. ...those of us who continue to work in this important area may benefit from your participation."

The least of the "benefit" is your personal thievery, the most is your hiding the fact that even now you refuse to cite who ended the suppressions you manage to suggest is your work or the benefaction of government. I have heard many accounts, for example, of your referring to the 1/27/64 transcript but in not one have you told any audience how to get it or who brought it to light or how.

I was at your press conference because you are the man of high principle who said he would throw me out when I agreed to cover it without pay for Zodiac News Service. I then got a list of those you suckered in and those you exploit and call an "executive committee".

You talk about co-workers with the tongue of a snake.

I know why you have Mary Ferrell and Robert Groden in. Mary for her library and Robert for the free use of his work on the Zapruder film. (He has nothing else to offer.)

But since you raise this question of "co-workers," have either you or Bud told your present "co-workers" about Mary Ferrell's beliefs? They present no problem to me. But did you give them enough information prior to conning them into joining your newest self-promotion and commercialization to let them know with what beliefs they were associating?

Or aside from her beliefs, which are her right, what she told me, that her husband is a Minuteman? That Ned Touchstone of The Councillor and the so-called White Citizens' Council is their close friend? So virulent a racist?

Between all of you there is not one with knowledge of the most elementary fact the others can depend on. Preeminently you as your puffery called a press conference shows. Next Bud, who will break the case in a half-day with three nonwitnesses.

You are doing the work, individually or collectively?

Did you, for example, file five FOIA suits while I was milking the subject for all it is worth? You are a lawyer. Did you help - except to help yourself to the fruit?

You are principled when you forced Walker, of American Program Bureau, to break the deal he had with me to book me, claiming you had an exclusive contract? (You owned this subject then, too?) Exclusivity did not apply to Clay Shaw, though, did it? I have the correspondence with your present assistant, Kathy Kinsella, on this. You are indeed a man of principle and you certainly, from your own record, do believe in people working together.

As long as you alone, no matter how, get the benefit, however at any time you conceive benefit to you.

COPY

You are depraved. You even took the only approach possible from my NYU speech - critical of you - and now pretend it to be your own when it has not been. Just as you now say you don't know who killed JFK, whereas when it was paying you well you proclaimed it was the CIA. Not only in well-paid speeches commercializing the Garrison disaster of which you are a major part but in signed articles. I have them.

As an investigator you couldn't find women in a whorehouse, much as you belong there. This is your record on the subject you now again try to claim as a personal property.

Once again your commercializing of it is dangerous. Now there is a prospect of some accomplishment to which you have in no way, now or ever, made any responsible contribution, so you are ripping off again. You have no real work of your own to use. This is what galls you. However, now the play is in Congress and there, no matter how many of your present associates or Members you may deceive, you will be fatal.

When in the past you pulled the same kind of self-aggrandizement, I had to prepare to protect the rest of us from its consequences. In the course of this I obtained copies of federal surveillance on me and, when you gave prospect of doing real harm, of you. All they have to do to ruin the Congress people you have conned is produce this stuff. (I have given copies to nobody. Not even when Ivon asked it of me.)

You not only claimed falsely that I wanted to attend your press conference to disrupt it, you even told your flunkies this. You and they carried it to this extreme: You even questioned college kids I had never met before simply because you and/or your flunkies saw them talking to me. You do hold principles - like Hoover.

Now, if you or those you are currently conning have any doubt about what I could have then done to you, I taped that conference. Any of you, call my bluff. Your survival in this field is dependent upon the tolerance of those who have done the work you never did and their concept of the common good. Your factual errors are atrocities.

Explain to your associates how 80 percent of what is in the Archives is still classified. Or tell them about the secret executive order LBJ issued to suppress everything. While you are at it, tell them how much time you have spent in the Archives or in any other way ending the suppressions that were real.

You have now stretched this too far. Our survival and success will have to be in spite of you and all the dishonesty you represent because with the federal record alone on you, without any new work, you'll ruin it all. You have always been irresponsible in what you said, having interests in self-promotion and money only. (As you wrote in "A Citizen's Dissent," BBC paid you "not a farthing." True. Something like 40 grand. I have the telegram. De Antonio gave it out. And the news accounts.)

I have not taken the time to consult copious files your whoring around required that I keep merely to defend the rest of us from your irresponsibility and commercializing. But I have them. If you dispute any of my statements, I'll take the time to provide copies if you in turn agree to provide them to all your executive committee and the Congress people you deal with.

COPY

Nobody writes me this kind of letter and finds me silent.
I await your response. In something less than about four weeks.

Truly,

Harold Weisberg

CERTIFIED -
RETURN RECEIPT

COPY